



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be of the Egyptian than the Gothic architecture,—have more the form of the pyramid than the cathedral, and rather boast of the breadth of its base than of the number and elevation of its spires.

4.—*The Knickerbocker, or New York Magazine, for October, 1836.*

THE October number of this Magazine treats us rudely and wrongly. We are sorry for it, for we like both editor and work. The matter of animadversion is the review of Glass's "Life of Washington," in the 92d Number of our journal.

We need not trouble ourselves with the fling at the "young gentleman who perpetrates the classical articles in the *North American*," any further than to say that it involves a two-fold mistake. We obtain our contributions in that department from various sources, and the author of the article in question is not a youth.

The writer of the notice in the *Knickerbocker* says, that the beauties of Glass's history are not "even so much as hinted at," in our review. We, however, expressly said, that Glass "is often happy in the choice of words and phrases," and mentioned "terseness and strength" as characteristic of portions of his work.

The writer goes on to complain, that "no merit whatever is ascribed to the fact of the author's having written his work at a distance from all those aids to composition, with which others are so abundantly supplied." What is meant by ascribing *merit* to the *fact* here stated, we do but indistinctly apprehend; but certain it is, that we took care to specify the want of the "necessary helps" to writing Latin, as one of the difficulties with which Glass had to struggle; and we clearly alluded to this want as one of the circumstances which "disarm criticism," in judging of the work.

The reviewer spoke of the writings of Cato, Varro, and Luceius, as "voluminous." This, especially in reference to Luceius, the writer in the *Knickerbocker* considers as a grievous error. If, however, any one will read Cicero's celebrated letter to Luceius, the twelfth of the fifth book of the familiar letters, he will find that this epithet, even in the case of Luceius, was properly applied. That the writings of these three authors were equally voluminous, is neither asserted by the reviewer, nor is it implied in his language. The author of the notice supposes, that the reviewer must have been ignorant that any of the works of Cato and Varro have come down to our time; and the prin-

cipal reason of his belief is, that the reviewer has classed these two authors with Lucceius, of whom "no writings whatever" remain. This reason, which in the opinion of the writer is so conclusive, is, however, entirely a fiction of his own. The fourteenth letter of the book of Cicero's letters, referred to above, is ascribed to Lucceius, and its authenticity is now probably for the first time denied. The important inference, therefore, fails. These authors were mentioned together, because a very small part of their writings is now extant, and they are less generally known as authors, than some of those whose names immediately followed.

The writer of the notice proceeds; "The reviewer makes mention also of the lost comedies of Plautus and Terence, and thinks, that if we had them, not only the 'vocabulary' of the Latin language, but its 'compass of expression' would be greatly enlarged." He then says, "that the genuine comedies of Plautus, as fixed by the Varronian canon, were only twenty-one in number, and that of these we have twenty remaining. Consequently but one is lost. What a wonderful play this lost one must have been," &c. Here is a misrepresentation, which would not have found its way into the work where it appears, except through some mishap. What the reviewer said was this. "If the voluminous writings of Cato, Varro, and Lucceius, and the lost works of Cicero, Livy, Sallust, Cæsar, Tacitus, Pliny, and of the numerous orators mentioned by Cicero and Tacitus, had been preserved; and if we now possessed the lost comedies of Plautus and Terence, and the innumerable dramatic works, which appeared in Rome, from the time of Plautus to the commencement of the decline of the Latin language, no doubt the vocabulary, as well as the compass of expression, would be enlarged." The writer, as may be seen above, has on his own responsibility inserted the word "greatly" before the word "enlarged"; an interpolation which was necessary in order to make his objection of any force. In addition to this, what must be the unscrupulousness of a writer, who would represent the reviewer as drawing his inference from Plautus and Terence only, when he had in fact drawn it from a long catalogue of authors?

As to the number of the lost plays of Plautus and Terence, without entering on a discussion of the question, it may be sufficient to say, that this writer himself has admitted, that one play of Plautus is lost, and he might have added, that parts of others are likewise lost; and if he had consulted Professor Anthon, he might have ascertained, that "the most learned and intelligent critics" have differed very widely as to the number of the come-

dies of Plautus, which they have admitted to be genuine, and that Varro himself seems on some occasion to have assented to the authenticity of several dramas in addition to the twenty-one, which are usually styled Varronian. Crusius is quoted by the writer of the notice, as advancing the opinion, "that in all likelihood we have *only* lost *above* one or two of the dramas of Terence." This language is not the most intelligible; but it seems to be here admitted, that enough of Terence has perished to justify the language of the reviewer. The whole passage is given above.

The reviewer had said, that "the changes of termination to make English names Latin, should be conducted by some rule;" and showed by examples, that Glass is faulty in this respect. The writer of the notice remarks, that inconsistencies like those pointed out in Glass, occur in other writers. This does little towards proving the rule not to be a proper one. The difference between Glass and the other authors referred to is this. In Glass, the faults in question are frequent; in the authors referred to, they appear so seldom, as to prove them to be mere negligences.

The writer of the notice is unskilled in verbal and grammatical criticism. His defence of Glass in the frequent use of the word *velitatio* is, that this word is used in approved translations from the Greek into Latin. But in such translations verbal exactness is usually aimed at; and, on this account, from the necessity of the case, great purity of language has not been required. Not one of his remarks on the other criticisms of the reviewer have the remotest bearing on the points at issue. The following is an instance of his acuteness most favorable to himself. The reviewer had objected to the phrase, "vacuandi recipiendique rationi contrarium." The author of the notice supposes, that all will be right, by inserting the reciprocal pronoun before "rationi." But in the name of all that is Latin, what does "vacuandi recipiendique se rationi contrarium," mean?

The writer says, that the motto on the title-page of Glass, was written by Professor Anthon; and adds, "will it be believed that this learned reviewer has certainly swallowed the whole for a genuine quotation from Cicero," and "actually mistook a piece of modern Latin for a passage from Cicero?" This he pronounces "the best part of the story." What deplorable shamelessness is here! The reviewer made no mention of this motto, nor alluded to it directly or indirectly.

For his credit's sake, and that of all who print for him, we commend our censor to a more self-denying use of his pen. It is an unsafe instrument in some hands.